

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 03/30/2005

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
07/728,428	07/11/1991	JO ANN M. CANICH	89B010-D-1	5216
23455	7590 03/30/2005		EXAMINER	
EXXONMOBIL CHEMICAL COMPANY			RABAGO, ROBERTO	
5200 BAYWAY DRIVE P.O. BOX 2149 BAYTOWN, TX 77522-2149				D 4 DCD 4 H 14 DCD
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1713	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	07/728,428	CANICH, JO ANN M.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Roberto Rábago	1713				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	ely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 Fe	bruary 2005.					
2a)☐ This action is FINAL . 2b)☒ This						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims	•					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>5,27,41 and 44-47</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>27 and 41</u> is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>5 and 44-47</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)⊠ The specification is objected to by the Examiner	•					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction	on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)	∆ □	(DTO 440)				
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Notice of References Cited (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	5) 🔲 Notice of Informal Pa	atent Application (PTO-152)				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6)					

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The new version of Table 1 filed 2/11/2005 is objected to because it has not included the amendment filed 10/22/1992 wherein the heading of the first column was changed to "T". Correction is required.

Double Patenting

- 2. Claims 5 and 44-47 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 27-32 of U.S. Application No. 07/973,261. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claims encompass the copending claims. Specifically, the copending claim set forth a subgeneric set of metallocene compounds, and if the copending claims were prior art, they would form the basis of a rejection under 35 USC 102.
- 3. Claims 5 and 44-47 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 of U.S. RE37,788. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because, except for the patented claims including Ti as a choice for M, the instant claims encompass the patented claims. However, one of ordinary skill in the art would immediately envisage each of Zr and Hf from the

Application/Control Number: 07/728,428 Page 3

Art Unit: 1713

disclosure of the group of Ti, Zr and Hf, and therefore if the copending claims were prior art, they would form the basis of a rejection under 35 USC 102.

- 4. Claims 5 and 44-47 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, and 4-9 of U.S. 5,955,625. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because, except for the patented claims including Ti as a choice for M, the instant claims encompass the patented claims. However, one of ordinary skill in the art would immediately envisage each of Zr and Hf from the disclosure of the group of Ti, Zr and Hf, and therefore if the copending claims were prior art, they would form the basis of a rejection under 35 USC 102.
- 5. Claims 5 and 44-47 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 of U.S. 5,621,126. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because, except for the patented claims including Ti as a choice for M, the instant claims encompass the patented claims. However, one of ordinary skill in the art would immediately envisage each of Zr and Hf from the disclosure of the group of Ti, Zr and Hf, and therefore if the copending claims were prior art, they would form the basis of a rejection under 35 USC 102.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 27 and 41 are allowed.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Roberto Rábago whose telephone number is (571) 272-1109. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:30 am - 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu can be reached on (571) 272-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Roberto Rábago Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1713

RR March 24, 2005